

DC 20503, be faxed to (202) 395-5806 or e-mailed to oir_submission@omb.eop.gov with a cc: to ICDocketMgr@ed.gov. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. The OMB is particularly interested in comments which: (1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Dated: April 14, 2011.

Darrin A. King,

Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Information Management and Privacy Services, Office of Management.

Office of the Secretary

Type of Review: Extension.

Title of Collection: U.S. Department of Education Supplemental Information for the SF-424 Form.

OMB Control Number: 1894-0007.

Agency Form Number(s): SF-424.

Frequency of Responses: New Awards.

Affected Public: Businesses and other for-profit; Individuals or household; Not-for-profit institutions, State, Local, or Tribal Government, State Educational Agencies or Local Educational Agencies.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 19,000.

Total Estimated Annual Burden Hours: 6,270.

Abstract: The U.S. Department of Education Supplemental Information form for the SF-424 is used together with the SF-424, Application for Federal Assistance. The Supplemental Information form includes several needed data elements/questions that are not included on the SF-424, Application for Federal Assistance. We

are requesting extension of the currently approved version of the Supplemental Information form.

Copies of the information collection submission for OMB review may be accessed from the RegInfo.gov Web site at <http://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain> or from the Department's Web site at <http://edicsweb.ed.gov>, by selecting the "Browse Pending Collections" link and by clicking on link number 3910. When you access the information collection, click on "Download Attachments" to view. Written requests for information should be addressed to U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., LBJ, Washington, DC 20202-4537. Requests may also be electronically mailed to the Internet address ICDocketMgr@ed.gov or faxed to 202-401-0920. Please specify the complete title of the information collection and OMB Control Number when making your request.

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339.

[FR Doc. 2011-9453 Filed 4-18-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Correction notice.

SUMMARY: On April 13, 2011, the Department of Education published a 30-day comment period notice in the **Federal Register** (Page 20635, Column 3) seeking public comment for an information collection entitled, "Study of the Distribution of Teacher Effectiveness." The title is hereby corrected to "Teacher Quality Distribution Study." The Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Information Management and Privacy Services, Office of Management, hereby issues a correction notice as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

Dated: April 14, 2011.

Darrin A. King,

Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Information Management and Privacy Services, Office of Management.

[FR Doc. 2011-9452 Filed 4-18-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Arbitration Panel Decision Under the Randolph-Sheppard Act

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of arbitration panel decision under the Randolph-Sheppard Act.

SUMMARY: The Department of Education (Department) gives notice that on December 15, 2010 an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *Richard Thelen v. Michigan Commission for the Blind, Case no. R-S/08-7*. This panel was convened by the Department under 20 U.S.C. 107d-1(a), after the Department received a complaint filed by the petitioner, Richard Thelen.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You may obtain a copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision from Suzette E. Haynes, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Room 5022, Potomac Center Plaza, Washington, DC 20202-2800.

Telephone: (202) 245-7374. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll-free, at 1-800-877-8339.

Individuals with disabilities can obtain this document in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under section 6(c) of the Randolph-Sheppard Act (Act), 20 U.S.C. 107d-2(c), the Secretary publishes in the **Federal Register** a synopsis of each arbitration panel decision affecting the administration of vending facilities on Federal and other property.

Background

Richard Thelen (Complainant) alleged violations by the Michigan Commission for the Blind, the State licensing agency (SLA), under the Act and its implementing regulations in 34 CFR part 395. The Complainant alleged that the SLA violated the Act, the implementing regulations, and State rules and regulations by suspending his vending operator's license at a vending facility at the Capitol View building under management of The Department of Community Health (DCH) in Lansing, Michigan (Capitol View).

On February 12, 2008, the SLA received a complaint from DCH alleging that the Complainant had poor sanitary conditions at Capitol View and demanded that Complainant be removed from the vending facility. On

February 13, 2008, the SLA suspended Complainant from the facility.

Complainant then requested a full evidentiary hearing from the SLA on this matter. On August 4, 2008, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a recommended decision.

On November 14, 2008, the SLA adopted the ALJ's recommendation as final agency action. Specifically, the SLA reimbursed Complainant for lost wages for the five-week period from the time that complainant was removed from his facility in February 2008 until his eligibility was restored in March 2008 and for the two additional weeks for a transition period to allow Complainant after his eligibility restoration to bid on other locations. In addition, the SLA reimbursed Complainant for attorney's fees and service time credit for time lost during his license suspension. Also, the SLA agreed to provide complainant assistance with bidding on new vending locations. However, the SLA denied the complainant's request for punitive damages.

Subsequently, Complainant filed with the Department a request for federal arbitration seeking an appeal of the state fair hearing decision based upon the following reasons: (1) Complainant alleged that the attorney fees of \$3,550 awarded to him by the SLA were inadequate; (2) Complainant requested service time for retirement alleging he would have been working if he had not been improperly removed from his facility; (3) Complainant requested that he receive a priority bid for another vending facility; (4) Complainant requested loss wages from the time he was removed from his facility to the time of his retirement several years in the future; (5) Complainant requested punitive damages because he asserts that the SLA summarily removed him from the facility and awarded it to another vendor before the SLA determined the validity of the complaint against him by DCH; and (6) Complainant alleged that he did not receive due process from the SLA.

Arbitration Panel Decision

After reviewing all of the evidence and testimony, the panel unanimously ruled:

(1) Complainant was entitled to be reimbursed for one Additional hour of attorney's fees in the amount of \$200.00.

(2) Complainant's request for service time for Retirement was under the authority of the Office of Retirement Services (ORS) and not under the authority of the Federal arbitration panel. However, the SLA agreed to recommend service credit to ORS for the

time Complainant's license was suspended.

(3) Complainant was not entitled to receive a priority bid for another vending facility based upon the findings that a priority bid would harm other vendors and there was no basis to determine that Complainant needed a priority bid in order to be successful.

(4) Complainant's request to be awarded lost wages from the time he was removed from his facility to the time of his later retirement was denied. However, the panel also ruled that the SLA's calculation of lost wages was unreasonable. The SLA had granted Complainant seven weeks of lost wage. This was based on the five-week period from the time the Complainant was removed from his facility in February 2008, until his eligibility was restored in March 2008, plus two additional weeks for a transition period to allow Complainant to bid on other locations once the SLA restored his eligibility.

The panel ruled that the transition period approved by the SLA was unreasonable in that it only allowed Complainant two weeks to bid on another location. Thus, the panel awarded the Complainant an additional ten weeks of lost wages at \$192.32 per week or a total amount of \$1,923.20.

(5) Complainant's request for punitive damages was denied based upon the finding that the SLA did not engage in extreme or outrageous behavior.

(6) Complainant had not been denied due process concerning his complaint given that any procedural errors were rectified based upon the timely restoration of his eligibility and compensatory damages.

The views and opinions expressed by the panel do not necessarily represent the views and opinions of the Department.

Electronic Access to This Document: The Official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**. Free Internet access to the official edition of the **Federal Register** and the Code of Federal Regulations is available via the Federal Digital System at: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys>. At this site you can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the **Federal Register**, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF). To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site.

Dated: April 14, 2011.

Alexa Posny,

Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

[FR Doc. 2011-9476 Filed 4-18-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Arbitration Panel Decision Under the Randolph-Sheppard Act

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of arbitration panel decision under the Randolph-Sheppard Act.

SUMMARY: The Department of Education (Department) gives notice that on October 1, 2010, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *James Swartz v. Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, Case no. R-S/08-11*. This panel was convened by the Department under 20 U.S.C. 107d-1(a), after the Department received a complaint filed by the petitioner, James Swartz.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: You may obtain a copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision from Suzette E. Haynes, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., Room 5022, Potomac Center Plaza, Washington, DC 20202-2800. Telephone: (202) 245-7374. If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll-free, at 1-800-877-8339.

Individuals with disabilities can obtain this document in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under section 6(c) of the Randolph-Sheppard Act (Act), 20 U.S.C. 107d-2(c), the Secretary publishes in the **Federal Register** a synopsis of each arbitration panel decision affecting the administration of vending facilities on Federal and other property.

Background

James Swartz (Complainant) alleged that the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, the State licensing agency (SLA), violated the Act and its implementing regulations in 34 CFR part 395. The Complainant alleged that the SLA improperly administered the transfer and promotion policies and procedures of the Alaska Randolph-Sheppard Vending Facility Program in violation of the Act, the implementing regulations under the Act, and State rules and regulations in considering Complainant's bid to manage a snack bar vending facility at the Nesbett Courthouse (Nesbett), a State court building, located in Anchorage, Alaska.